

**REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claim 21, and leaves claims 23 and 25-27 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 21, 23, and 25-27.

**Interview Summary**

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview conducted on August 15, 2008, and for conducting several follow-up discussions regarding the amended claim language. In the interview, arguments were presented to overcome the cited references, particularly Gole and Wong. The Examiner and Applicants' representative did not come to an agreement with regard to the arguments presented. However, the Examiner recommended further amending the claims to include features of the WORM attribute, to more clearly distinguish over the prior art. In this response, Applicants have incorporated the Examiner's recommendations.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

Claims 21-23 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0015460 to Gole et al. ("Gole") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2001/0051955 to Wong. As discussed in the amendment filed on August 11, 2008, claim 22 was canceled. Therefore, this rejection regarding claim 22 is rendered moot. This rejection regarding the remaining claims 21, 23 and 25-27 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claims 21, 23 and 25-27, are not taught or suggested by Gole or Wong, whether taken individually or in combination with each other in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Applicants submit that neither Gole nor Wong, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a first storage system as recited, for example, in independent claim 21.

For example, Gole and Wong fail to teach or suggest "wherein the memory stores a volume management table, which comprises:

a logical volume identifier that identifies each of the plurality of logical volumes, wherein each of the plurality of logical volumes stores only files that were created on a same date;

a Write Once Read Many (WORM) identifier that provides a WORM attribute indicating whether a write only once and a read many times operation is permitted for each of the plurality of logical volumes; and

a file system identifier that identifies either a primary file system or a secondary file system corresponding to each of the plurality of logical volumes, wherein the primary file system is stored in the first storage system and the secondary file system is stored in the second storage system,

wherein the volume management table further comprises, for each of the plurality of logical volumes other than the logical volume corresponding to a primary file system comprising the first file system, a date that indicates when files were stored in the primary file system" as recited in claim 21.

By way of further example, Gole and Wong fail to teach or suggest "wherein at a second date, the files stored in the primary file system on a first date are migrated from the first storage system to the secondary file system in

the second storage system" and "wherein after migration at the second date,  
the management terminal updates the file system identifier in the volume  
management table to indicate that the files migrated from the primary file  
system are now stored in the secondary file system, and updates the WORM  
identifier corresponding to the files stored on the first date to indicate that the  
write only once and a read many times operation is permitted for the files  
stored on the first date, and the secondary file system is mounted on the first  
file system such that the migration is not recognized by the computer" as  
recited in claim 21.

Both Gole and Wong suffer from the same deficiencies, relative to the features of the present invention, as recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings of Gole and Wong in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 21, 23 and 25-27 as being unpatentable over Gole in view of Wong are respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references used in the rejection of claims 21, 23 and 25-27.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 21, 23 and 25-27 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 21, 23 and 25-27 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.43772X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

/Carl I. Brundidge/  
Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/DKM/cp  
703-684-1120